

Reflections on Economic Guidelines and Modeling of State Governance - Part IV *Identifying key challenges and solutions for Brazil*

Mario Cezar Silva Serpa¹

Among the pillars of our democracy stand the control and advisory agencies and institutions, such as the Government Accountability Office (TCU), Attorney General's Office (AGU), Union's Internal Affairs Office (CGU), Union's Prosecution Office (MPU), etc. They are the ones who, each in their own way and with their own attributions and autonomy, should guarantee efficiency in the control over public administration issues. We are far from a great spot here. The dynamics of the processes and the constant changes in the challenges that reality imposes on us, demand that the procedures have a greater integration, and a union of efforts to promote an improvement in the quality of expenditure and efficiency of public management as described in [Part I](#).

The sequence of ideas and suggestions presented in the Papers [Part I](#), [Part II](#) and [Part III](#), will not be sustainable if they do not have resonance in the control and advisory agencies and institutions. Without prejudice to its independence and autonomy, the restructuring of the control and management system of the Executive Branch requires integration and realignment of processes with other related agencies. More than that, there is an urgent need to integrate initiatives to ensure the organization, timeliness and improvement of policies, without "smothering" management. These adjustments assume a new format, whose actions can serve as feedback and course correction, and not exclusively for the identification of past errors and/or distortions. The *ex-ante* note-taking attitude, in this new format, is imperative to align – impartially – the best practices. It should be noted that this is not a question of rescuing the century-old control of expenses instituted by Rui Barbosa when the TCU was created; quite the contrary, it means to add, without unifying, initiatives to better serve the public interest. Some activities in certain institutions already follow this precept, but it is still shy, incipient, fragile and restricted. We need to expand and integrate these procedures in a rational, equitable and unified manner. The idea is to innovate and prevent important management risks.

This systematization and integration of processes of bodies and institutions, ensuring their missions, autonomy and independence, require much more willingness to act on the part of the parties than (possibly) legal changes. A pact can be reached in which management mechanisms are operationally available so that the main projects are carried out in this system,

until all adjustments are made and all other objectives can be achieved. It is about outlining the fundamental issues for the country, and moving forward on the main one. Here lies, definitively, the satisfaction of the public interest, through preventive and final controls that are non-binding and not reliant on co-management.

The integration of work methods within the scope of control agencies must occur through collaboration, cooperation and sharing of data and information, avoiding overlapping, duplication and fragmentation of initiatives that generate waste, delays and losses for the country. As an example of the integration of the work procedure proposed here, we can cite the episode of the school buses purchase by the FNDE (National Fund for the Development of Education), wherein "inconsistency" was detected and, through audit techniques generally accepted, the CGU identified in advance to the enactment of any irregularities. Whether by this methodology, using the famous "robots" or even any other applicable, what matters is not only the interaction with the TCU for the continuity of the investigation, but also the concomitant submission of these findings to an appropriate committee, for knowledge, continuous and proactive feedback with a view to making necessary and timely adjustments in management – it is about the spirit of proactivity and effective purposeful collaboration in the process.

So, if on the side of management it is advisable that those who plan should not execute, and those who execute should not be responsible for oversight, for maximum efficiency, we also have, on the governance side, the need for evaluation and monitoring. It is this integration and dynamism that we lack, which can be supplied with protocol measures in the constitution of bureaucratic structures for this purpose. In this sense, this organization could be standardized between each agency or institution with its correspondent department in the Executive branch, with format, guidelines and topics to be addressed.

The main purpose is to stop short of the point of interrupting the continuity of a public auction bidding, but rather to point out the requirements of the event, any inconsistencies and alignment with the required compliance guidelines. Preventing the approval and adjudication of the process certainly prevents illegality, but does not help advancing the country's needs.

¹Mario Serpa is an Economist and Partner at Redwood Asset Management.